

Appl. No. 10/760,168
Resp. dated April 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 28, 2006

Argument

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to applicants' attorney in the telephone interview with the Examiner on April 12, 2006.

Applicants respectfully repeat the response to the initial restriction requirement in the paper filed on February 16, 2006 and submit that the claims 1 - 20 and 21 - 36 are properly classified together and according should not separated into Groups I and II. Specifically, if claims 1 - 20 are properly classifiable in Class 211, subclass 94.01, claims 21 - 36 are as well. In addition, applicants respectfully submit that neither claims 21 - 36 nor claims 1 - 20 appear to be properly classifiable in class 312, subclass 132 since no cabinet structure classifiable in class 312, subclass 114 is present in claims 1 - 36. Claims 21 - 36 contain similar limitations to claims 1 - 20 with the addition of slotwall panel limitations that should be classified similar to a slot track.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that claims 37 - 41 and 42 - 46 are properly classified together and accordingly should not be separated into Groups III and IV. Specifically, if claims 37 - 41 are properly classifiable in class 312, subclass 249.9, claims 42 - 46 are as well. In addition, applicants respectfully submit that neither claims 42 - 46 nor claims 37 - 41 appear to be properly classifiable in class 52, subclass 36.5, see the comments in the class definition that suggest class 312 for structures like those set forth in claims 37 - 46. Claims 42 - 46 contain similar limitations to claims 37 - 41 with the addition of slotwall panel limitations that should be classified similar to a slot track.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement should be modified to two groups, namely Group I including claims 1 - 36 and Group II including claims 37 - 46. Applicants have elected sub-species (ii) - Figures 8 and 8A for examination. Applicants' election of claims 1 - 17 should be interpreted as electing claims 1 - 17, 21, 22 and 26 - 36 upon the Examiner agreement with applicants' proposed modification of the restriction requirement to two groups as set forth above.

Interview
Record OK
DS/17/06